UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,556	08/17/2001	Gerard Chauvel	TI-32850	3902

23494	7590	12/14/2004

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999
DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER
TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/932,556	GERARD CHAUVEL
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LeChi Truong	2126	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 August 2001_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-12_ is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-5 and 7-12_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _6_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-12 are presented for the examination.

2.   The cross reference related to the application cited in the specification must be updated

(i.e. update the relevant status, with PTO serial numbers or patent numbers where appropriated,

on page 1 of T1-31366US).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims **1-5, 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe et al

(US. 5,906,000) in view of Flahive et al (US. Patent 4,449,183).

4.   **As to claim 1**, Abe teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: access to the

shared resource (col 3, ln 52-55), address space regions (the address 44 of the caches memory

18, col 4, ln 17-21/ Fig. 2), an address space of the shard resource (the cache memory 18, col 3,

ln 65-67), organizing an address space of the shared resources into address space regions (col 1,

ln 56-59 / col 4, ln 20-23), access priority value (a priority corresponding to each data, col 1, ln

56-58), assigning individual access priority value to a plurality of the address space regions(col

1, ln 55-59/ col 4, ln 19-23), initiating an access request (col 1, ln 59-63/ col 38-41), the access request specifies a target address within the address space of the shared resource(col 5, ln 22-26/ col 6, ln 12-19), providing an access priority value with the access request(col 5, ln 21-24/ col 7, ln 13-16), the access priority value corresponds to an access priority value assigned to an address space region selected by the target address(col 6, ln 17-21/col 7, ln 17-21), access to the shared resource by using the access priority value(col 1, ln 60-67/ col 7, ln17-21).

5.   Abe does not explicit teach a plurality of devices, arbitrating, digital. However, Flahive teaches a plurality of devices, arbitrating (a plurality of devices, col 3, ln 37-40/ arbitration, col 2, ln 16-17/ digital, col 1, ln 30-31).

6.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Abe and Flahive because Flahive's a plurality of devices, arbitrating would assure equal use opportunity to each processing device by honoring requests for use on a rotating priority basis.

7.   **As to claim 2,** Abe teaches an access priority value to an address space region according to a program or data stored within the address space region (col 2, ln 36-37).

8.   **As to claim 3,** Abe teaches assigning a first access priority value to a first one of the several address space regions and assigns a different access priority value to a second one of the several address space regions (col 1, ln 56-58).

9.   **As to claim 4,** Abe teaches a plurality of program tasks occupy a single address space regions (col 3, ln 47-50).

10.   **As to claim 5,** Abe teaches starting a program task (col 4, ln 39-42), determining an access priority value specified by the program task (col 4, ln 40-41), allocating an address space

region for the program task (col 6, ln 12-17/ col 6, ln 46-50), assigning the access priority value

specified by the program task to the address space region allocated for the program task (col 6, ln

12-17/ col 6, ln 46-50).

11.   As to claim 7, Abe teaches an execution priority value of a program task to which the

address space region is allocated (col 7, ln 19-21).

12.   Claims **8, 9 and 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Narayanan et al (US. Patent 4,814,974) in view of Welland (US. Patent 5,581,722).

13.   As to claim 8, Narayanan teaches a digital system (digital control, col 1, ln 21-22), a

shared resource (a resource, col 2, ln 47-48/ ln 63-64), a plurality of devices (devices, col 1, ln

21-22/ ln 63-64), a plurality of devices connected to access the shared resource (col 1, ln 21-22),

a memory unit (memory unit, col 7, ln 20-21), a plurality of page entries and each page entry has

an access priority field (col 2, ln 49-55/ col 7, ln 52-59), output an access priority value in

response to received a request(col 5, ln 30-34/col 4, ln 26-30), arbitration circuitry connected to

receive a request signal from each of the plurality of device and an access priority value from

each memory unit(col 4, ln 26-29/ ln 51- 55/ abstract ln 5-11 and ln 21-26), the arbitration

circuitry is operable to schedule access to the shared resource according to the access priority

values(col 4, ln 26-30).

14.   Narayana do not explicit teach a memory unit as MMUs and receiving an address.

However, Welland teaches a memory unit as MMUs and receiving an address (Memory

Management units, col 1, ln 50-51/ a virtual address issued by the CPU, col 2, ln 42-44).

15.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Narayanan and Welland because Welland's a memory unit

as MMUs and receiving an address would provide a memory management unit (MMU) for

controlling a CPU's right access a memory in order to initiate performance of operation.

16.   **As to claim 9**, Welland teaches a translation lookaside buffer (TLB (translation lookaside

buffer), col 2, ln 47-48).

17.   **As to claim 11**, Narayanan teaches the shared resource is a bus, a plurality of memory-

mapped resources connected to the bus (col 4, ln 26-30).

18.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanan et al

(US. Patent 4,814,974) in view of Welland (US. Patent 5,581,722) and further in view of David

Eck(xLogicCircuits Lab 2: Memory Circuits).

19.   **As to claim 10,** Narayanan and Welland do not teach a memory circuit. However, David

teaches memory circuit (memory circuit, page 5, section Random Access Memory, ln 1).

20.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Narayanan, Welland and David because David 's memory

circuit would hold several different binary numbers, which can be used to represent both

program and data.

21.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanan et al

(US. Patent 4,814,974) in view of Welland (US. Patent 5,581,722) and further in view Lysejko et

al (US. Patent 5,918,160).

22.   As to claim 12, Narayanan and Welland do not teach a wireless communication, a

display, radio frequency circuitry, and an aerial. However, Lysejko teaches a wireless

communication, a display, radio frequency circuitry, an aerial (Wireless telecommunications

system, col 3, ln 61-62/ display 810, col 15, ln 30-31/ radio frequency circuitry, col 10, ln 55-56/

an aerial, col 25, ln 12-13).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Narayanan, Welland and Lysejko because Lysejko 's

teaches a wireless communication, a display, radio frequency circuitry, an aerial would provide a

subscriber station of a wireless telecommunications system which comprises transmitter/receiver

for wireless communication.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

December 2, 2004

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER